

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/762,616	01/22/2004	Luisa Hernandez-Ramirez	91349	5023	
24628 Husch Blackw	7590 06/01/200 ell Sanders, LLP	EXAM	EXAMINER		
Husch Blackwell Sanders LLP Welsh & Katz			SIMMONS	SIMMONS, CHRIS E	
120 S RIVERS 22ND FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, II	. 60606	1612	1612		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/01/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

_								
Application No.		Applicant(s)						
10/762,616		HERNANDEZ-RAMIREZ ET AL.						
	Examiner	Art Unit						
	CHRIS E. SIMMONS	1612						

			1					
	CHRIS E. SIMMONS	1612						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
THE REPLY FILED 04 May 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.						
application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App	reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this ilication, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the lication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time							
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> </ul>								
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(		FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.138(a). The data have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checket. Any reply received by the Office are may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL.	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	iled within two month	s of the date of					
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>								
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			cause					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		E below);						
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		to the second second term of						
(c)   ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.						
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1								
The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).								
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	lowable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explan how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:								
Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3.5.6.13 and 15-22</u> .								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>								
D. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).								
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
11. \(\sumeq\) The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.								
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).								
13. Other:								
	10 11 11 015 1 1							
	/Gollamudi S Kishore/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1612						

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant has proposed to amend claims 1 and 2 to recite the limitation "uniform mixture". This limitation was not previously considered in regard to the compositions of the claims, and further analysis would be required to determine whether a uniform mixture of tinidazole and fluconazole in a dosage unit would have been been obvious. Additionally a further search would also have to be made to determine the state of the art with regard to this issue.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Application are patentiable over the prior art references are moot at this time due to non-entry of the proposed amendment.